

Minutes
Regular meeting of the City of Reading Planning Commission
June 28, 2016 at 7:04 pm

Members present:

Wayne Jonas Bealer, Chairman
William F. Cinfici, Vice Chairman
Michael E. Lauter, Secretary
Ermete J. Raffaelli

Staff present:

Andrew W. Miller, Planning Office
Ralph E. Johnson, Department of Public Works
Timothy J. Krall, Department of Public Works

Others present:

Adam J. Brower, Edward B. Walsh & Associates Inc.
Christopher J. Williams, Barry Isett & Associates Inc.
Christopher J. Hartman, Hartman Valeriano Magovern & Lutz PC
Jamie L. Keith, Berks Surveying & Engineering Inc.
Dale C. Egan, Egan & Egan LLC
Thomas P. Egan, Egan & Egan LLC
Gregg A. Bogia, Bogia Engineering Inc.
David H. McLain, Radkra LLC
Aristides I. Otero, Stackhouse Bensinger Inc.
Douglas F. Smith, Alvernia University
David A. Reppert, Alvernia University
Victoria E. Krall
Stephen F. DeLucas, Reading Eagle Company

Chairman Bealer called the June meeting to order and asked for acceptance of the agenda. Mr. Miller mentioned an approval reaffirmation to be addressed at the end. Mr. Lauter moved to accept the June 28th agenda, as modified. Mr. Cinfici seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to accept the June agenda.

Subdivision and Land Development:

3150 S.F. Building Addition (Piazza Acura) – final subdivision and land development plan [0:00.43]

Mr. Brower introduced himself, alluding to the time elapsed since his last appearance (at the July 28, 2015 meeting). He mentioned the challenge in answering to both the dealership's owner and the vehicle manufacturer who dictates the design requirements. He said there was a lot of 'back and forth', and he didn't want to keep presenting the changes to the Planning Commission until he had some certainty. He noted that the plan's title has since become somewhat misleading by the reconfigured and increased expansions. He explained that a 152-square-foot 'bump out' in the front elevation had since been deleted, on account of concern for the large storm sewer traversing the site. An addition in the rear, for a redesigned service area, remains and has been expanded. A 1400-square-foot addition in the front corner remains, for additional inventory, while another 1654-square-foot addition has been proposed for the side, as a reception area. He said the existing site is essentially 'all pavement' and that they have included a landscaping plan which, not only helps to break that up, but also helps to separate the drive aisle from the inventory display area. He described curbed islands containing it, and some more bordering the front of the property, thinking there might be additional opportunities if an expansion of the adjacent Honda dealership moves ahead in the future. He acknowledged receiving the June 24th Planning Office review, suggesting he might request a meeting to verify the necessary corrections, but otherwise confident he could resolve the issues identified. *[recording stopped at 4:56 in, and picking up at 4:57 into Part 1 of the BCTV 'on-demand' file]* Mr. Miller asked if he'd received a zoning permit. Mr. Brower said he submitted an application with the original plan, but never received any response. Mr. Miller noted that the first presentation to the Planning Commission was made on June 23, 2015, and wondered why there was never any follow up in a year. Mr. Brower acknowledged the need to pursue a permit. Mr. Miller asked if the Berks County Conservation District had reviewed the latest erosion and sedimentation controls. Mr. Brower said not, wanting to make his presentation to the Planning Commission first, in case of any changes. He called that the 'next step'. Asked about the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation's (PennDOT) input, he said there shouldn't be any issues. Mr. Miller recalled earlier reviews advising that they be consulted and make their position known regarding the modifications of the driveways. Mr. Brower insisted they weren't doing anything within the right-of-way, but said he'd seek their determination. Mr. Lauter recognized the

several changes made over the course of a year, still lacking any of the other required permits. Mr. Brower again referred to the PennDOT jurisdiction ending at the right-of-way. He said they had the Conservation District's approval of an earlier layout, and never received a response to their zoning application. Mr. Miller said that application was irrelevant, given the changes since, and that neither of the last two revisions had been submitted for zoning permitting. Mr. Bealer thought PennDOT might have something to communicate regarding the driveway use. Mr. Brower understood that to apply only in cases of changing volumes.

Turning to the engineering issues, Mr. Johnson noted his concern with the Acura building's proximity to the 72-inch corrugated-steel storm sewer, seeking additional information on the foundation design and loading, a more-accurate depiction of the pipe itself, profile views comparing the other utilities crossing it, and the location of what appeared to be an electric vault currently missing from the plan. Mr. Brower said he'd revise the plan accordingly and include the architect's design of the footers. He added that the client has his own concerns vis-à-vis the potential for foundation settlement. Mr. Krall added that the easement shown should extend through the property, rather than stopping at the Honda building directly above it. Mr. Brower called it a special case, where they want to provide the City sufficient access while avoiding any such disruption and disturbance within the building.

Mr. Raffaelli asked about a possible height reduction of the existing chimney and an adjustment of the floodlights facing the residential area at the rear of the Honda building. Mr. Brower thought the chimney might be covered in a future Honda project, while the floodlights could be adjusted in the meantime. Mr. Miller noted other existing violations, mentioned in his previous reviews, including vehicle parking in the grass of the Gregg Street right-of-way and dumpsters situate in the western stub of Gregg Street. Mr. Brower said those dumpsters belonged to the neighboring Masano BMW dealership at 1015 Lancaster Avenue. He said they could 'incorporate' the parking violation into the plan. Mr. Miller said it should be addressed now, with or without the plan, unless they have some special permission for it. Mr. Brower said he didn't observe it during any of his visits. Mr. Miller noted some other existing infrastructure not located, also noted in each of his reviews. Mr. Brower thought they had identified everything and said he'd look into it. Mr. Cinfici asked if architectural elevations were available. Mr. Brower said he could provide them. Mr. Miller noted another expiring Planning Code deadline and another three-month extension offered. He said he didn't see any value in continuing to review the plan until such time as some action could be taken. He felt they should have the zoning and erosion control permits in-hand prior to any further presentation to the Planning Commission. Mr. Brower agreed. Asked how certain he was in having addressed the design needs of the local ownership and corporate parties involved, he said he was hopeful, having submitted the latest revisions to each. Mr. Lauter asked about the specific landscaping proposed. Mr. Brower mentioned a plan included in the full set. He said it didn't call for any trees, but showed several groundcover varieties and river stone. Mr. Miller confirmed that a complete plan and schedule, prepared by another party, was included. He understood that trees can be a challenge where the view of 'inventory' is paramount, while alluding to the creative designs of some neighboring dealership properties. He recognized the challenge of satisfying the design guidelines of the vehicle brands, having become familiar with the practice from other projects, but added that it was time to move the plan ahead.

Mr. Lauter moved to table the final Piazza plan. Mr. Cinfici seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to table the '3150 S.F. Building Addition at 1001 Lancaster Avenue' final plan.

Mr. Cinfici moved to extend the review of the '3150 S.F. Building Addition at 1001 Lancaster Avenue' plan by three months, as requested in a June 28th letter emailed from the project manager. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to approve a three-month extension for the Piazza Honda and Acura dealerships' final subdivision and land development plan, satisfying the terms of §508.3 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

Resolution #22-2016

Nature Place at Angelica Creek Park – preliminary land development plan [0:26:55, of the BCTV file]

Mr. Williams referred to the two earlier presentations. *[picking up with the second audio file – about 23 minutes lost – where at 27:46 into Part 1 of the BCTV file]* He said the lead engineer and Berks Nature's executive director were unable to attend, but thought the revised plan resolved the floodplain issue, and without requiring a special exception hearing. He referred to an email, received earlier that day from the 'floodplain administrator' (i.e. the Zoning Administrator), directing them to address the Zoning Ordinance (Part 18) criteria. It requires that they demonstrate the construction will not raise the base-flood elevation by more than one foot, that the building's finished-floor elevation will be at least a foot-and-a-half above the base-flood elevation, and that they comply with the construction standards for a floodplain. He explained that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) had delineated a new floodplain and floodway, that the proposed construction is wholly outside the floodway, that they're not increasing the flood elevation, that the finished-floor elevation is over six feet above the flood elevation,

and that they will satisfy all floodplain-specific construction specifications. A letter documenting these findings will then be attached to the existing zoning permit for the project. Mr. Miller thought that enough of an answer, but again requested the foundation information (discussed at the May meeting) to better illustrate the extent of the cantilevered design relative to the floodplain. Mr. Williams agreed. Asked if there was further soil testing to be performed, as a note on the grading plan suggests, he thought not, but intended to clarify the note. Mr. Miller asked about the changing dimensions of the septic system's two absorption areas. Mr. Williams said it reflects the more-accurate information from the separate design plans of that system, and was previously shown inaccurately. Asked about the recommendation for piped connections to both absorption areas, at the outset, he said he didn't believe they intended to do so.

Mr. Miller questioned the usage of the terms 'owner', 'landowner', 'permittee' and 'co-permittee' in the assignments of maintenance responsibilities. Mr. Hartman referred to the lease agreement between Berks Nature and the City. *[recording stopped at 8:50 in, and picking up at 36.34 into Part 1 of the BCTV file]* He said it has three key components: 1) it authorizes improvements constructed by Berks Nature, which include the stormwater facilities, 2) it directs that they obtain approvals and permits, and 3) it assigns to Berks Nature maintenance responsibilities for all the improvements. He felt the responsibilities sufficiently covered, preferring not to restate every obligation under the lease and risk potentially conflicting language. *[picking up with the third audio file, where at 38.01 into Part 1 of the BCTV file]* He suggested keeping the broadly-written summary language, adding that it must be understood in the context of the lease agreement. He said the statements identifying the City as the owner are required as a term of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting. He said, if deemed inadequate, they might explore an amendment to the lease. Mr. Miller hoped that wouldn't be necessary, just wanting to make certain the summaries are consistent with the lease. He noted at least one instance of the term 'landowner' in a way not further qualified. Mr. Johnson agreed it needed clarification. Mr. Krall referred to the notes on the post-construction stormwater management plan. Mr. Hartman consented to some 'tweaking' of the language, still hoping to avoid any conflicting or confusing language, and asked for conditional approval, acknowledging Berks Nature's responsibilities under the lease. He said the lease covers many things beyond the scope of the environmental center project, and mentioned the existing wetlands project, the Park's road and other open space areas. He noted that the City retains some responsibilities, including police protection. Mr. Bealer appreciated the background and the apparent progress made since the May presentation. Mr. Johnson sought additional utility details, including the profile views. He said the on-lot sewage system appears to be undersized for certain events, wanting some assurance that portable toilets would be arranged and used when necessary. He referred to the intended 'harvesting' of onsite materials for use in the project, directing that all intended tree removals be clearly identified. He mentioned two other agreements – between the City and Berks Nature, and between the City and Alvernia University – and his interpretation that Berks Nature was not only required to share their design with the University, but obtain their formal consent. Mr. Hartman called that a contractual obligation and not a regulatory issue. Mr. Miller reminded him that the Planning Commission is representing the interests of the landowner. Mr. Smith affirmed that the University would indicate its support in writing. He understood the tripartite agreement to deal with the management of the 'boathouse', in the interim, and effectively expiring following the construction of the addition. Mr. Hartman said those terms will have been fulfilled, but the two-party agreement between the City and Berks Nature, also covering the maintenance responsibilities, will remain in effect for its 99-year term. He attempted to recite the items to be addressed, and again requested a conditional approval. Mr. Miller referred to the many items in the review letters. Mr. Hartman called it a 'discrete list' that they could satisfy. Mr. Miller questioned the four reserved parking spaces, wondering how the 'low-emitting fuel-efficient vehicles' are qualified and enforced. Mr. Williams said it was a part of their pursuit of the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) credits. Mr. Miller questioned the quantity, and whether the terms of the lease covered it. Mr. Krall questioned the LEED qualification of a design in a floodplain. Mr. Johnson suggested it would 'interrupt' the limited parking. Mr. Williams intended to research it and, if necessary, delete them. Mr. Miller suggested a single reserved space would be more reasonable. Mr. Hartman thought it would be a credit to the City to obtain the LEED certification. Mr. Lauter asked how that reserved parking would be enforced. Mr. Williams thought it might be 'unenforceable' and instead a matter of the public's cooperation. Mr. Miller asked if they'd received and considered his review letter. Mr. Williams said he had and had no objections. Asked about the Public Works Department review, Mr. Williams believed they could satisfactorily address it, with the possible exception of the ownership and responsible party terms used. Mr. Krall said they'd at least seek further clarification in those notes. Mr. Hartman called their use of those terms intentional, and required with respect to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) permitting. Mr. Williams offered to consult the Berks County Conservation District and attempt to allay those concerns with additional notes. Mr. Johnson recalled a similar situation elsewhere, where interpretations differ, thinking it could be resolved. Mr. Hartman considered trying to more affirmatively define those terms.

Mr. Krall asked for utility profile views. Mr. Miller noted that the same had been referenced in his own

review letters. Mr. Williams agreed to detail the storm and sanitary sewers, showing the crossings of other potentially-conflicting utilities. Mr. Miller noted the reduced diameters of both the domestic and fire water laterals. Mr. Williams said that revision came from some recent coordination with the Reading Area Water Authority (RAWA). Mr. Miller wondered if the building inspectors, having already approved the architectural plans, should have another opportunity to review that change. Mr. Williams intended to seek clarification. Asked if a soil 'stockpile' shown on certain plan sheets was intended as a permanent feature, he answered that it was, representing the excess material and balance of the grading. Mr. Miller said he'd referred the lease summary and maintenance notes to the Law Department, for their consideration, and asked that they resolve the language to their satisfaction. Mr. Hartman agreed, subject to the other regulatory commitments already identified. Mr. Krall asked for some further clarification on the use and placement of the temporary construction fencing. Mr. Williams agreed, referring to some information already on the demolition plan. Mr. Miller said that, if they agreed to revise the plan as directed by the most-recent Planning Office and Public Works Department reviews, which includes the referral to the Law Department, he supported a conditional final approval. Mr. Cinfici asked about the building address issue. Mr. Miller, understanding the building to be classified as an 'addition', said it would share the '575 St. Bernardine Street' designation previously assigned to the existing (boathouse) building when it was renovated. Asked if those terms were acceptable, Mr. Williams answered 'yes'.

Mr. Cinfici moved to grant a final approval to the land development plan, on the condition of the record set's satisfaction of the June 24th Planning Office review and the June 28th Public Works Department review. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to conditionally approve Berks Nature's 'Nature Place at Angelica Creek Park' plan.

Resolution #23-2016

Angelica Street Storage – final land development plan [0:32.29]

Dale Egan explained that they were in the process of demolishing about 35,000 square feet of a 50,000-square-foot warehouse, foundry and office complex, keeping the more-modern cement-block building indicated on the plan, and proposing storage units in the newly-cleared area. Mr. Raffaelli recalled the former Oakbrook Elementary school having occupied the site, and some other history leading to the most-recent use by the Crescent Brass Manufacturing Corporation. Dale Egan described the bridge trusses, railroad tracks, and cranes left behind by Crescent Brass upon its bankruptcy and sale (officially closed March 27, 2015, though machining work stopped that February). Asked for the number of storage units, Thomas Egan said that hadn't yet been settled. Mr. Miller asked if they had identified any tenants or uses for the surviving building. Thomas Egan said they had at least one in mind, for an F-2 (factory) or S-2 (storage) occupancy which would alleviate the sprinkler requirement. Dale Egan thought it promising but challenged by some delays in reconnecting the building to the necessary utility services. He described the would-be tenant as a machine-assembly and rigging operation, drawn to the two bridge cranes and high ceilings. Thomas Egan measured 35 feet from the deck, with an eight-foot truss. Dale Egan said he regretted the demolition, but didn't think it a feasible investment to install a sprinkler system. Mr. Miller characterized the surviving structure as a 'building within a building'. Dale Egan agreed and referred to its more-modern amenities. Asked about any environmental constraints, Dale Egan mentioned Phase 1 and Phase 2 assessments undertaken by the previous owner, and some heavy-metal contaminants detected. He understood it had something to do with deposition from the foundry's exhaust fans. Thomas Egan mentioned Liberty Environmental Inc. and some clearance obtained under Pennsylvania's Act 2 (Land Recycling and Environmental Remediation Standards Act of 1995). Mr. Miller asked that a summary be provided on the plan, with references to any Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) files numbers and correspondence.

Dale Egan confirmed that the storage leases would involve the same rules and restrictions, and the same on-line customer interface as he described for his recently-approved project on West Greenwich Street. He described the one-way-in-one-way-out circulation and the egress via an alley. Thomas Egan said the five storage buildings outlined will be placed as shown, but the individual-unit divisions within them, and so the total count questioned, had yet to be designed. Mr. Lauter asked about the intended landscaping, screening and site lighting. Dale Egan counted eight street trees. He thought the grade change from Angelica Street and the eight-foot retaining wall provided sufficient screening. He said the site itself is already level enough for their needs and 'ramped' at the access points. He said minimal lighting will be included, in the form of 'wall packs' on the new building. The entire site is already enclosed in chain-link fencing. Asked if there would be any grading, Mr. Keith said not, describing a stone base and paving overlay, hoping to avoid the cost of disturbing the existing concrete pad. Mr. Miller advised that they get the interpretation and position of the Berks County Conservation District directly. Regarding the zoning permitting, Dale Egan said that application was submitted on the same day as the land development plan, but there hadn't been any response to his follow-up calls. He said they 'went over everything' with the Zoning Administrator, and believed he provided all the supplemental information requested. Mr. Miller said the plan would have to be tabled for that and some other requisite inputs, but complimented the first effort. Mr.

Keith anticipated making some changes in the designed elevations and stormwater flows. Mr. Miller acknowledged the 'natural screening' of the site, and the neighboring self-storage, railroad and bakery. Mr. Johnson said the Public Works Department needed a little more time in their review, given the 'final' status of the plan. Mr. Miller said they still needed the County Planning Commission's review, as well. Mr. Krall asked about sewer capacity and connection issues. Dale Egan expected the load to decrease and didn't intend any changes to the existing connection. Thomas Egan mentioned the citations against the prior owner for discharge violations. Referring to the water service, Dale Egan relayed the Reading Area Water Authority's (RAWA) aversion to the length of the pipe run shown, within the property, and the possibility of a route below and along the sidewalk to the nearest building corner. He said he's paying for a water service that isn't presently connected. Mr. Miller noted the locations of the existing fire hydrants, including one 'to be relocated'. Mr. Keith described the conflict with the driveway design, but a possibility of modifying the driveway to avoid the hydrant and the widening effect on the alley. He mentioned a retaining wall and the ownership issues relative to the neighboring (640 Park Avenue) property. The existing width of the Angelica Street-Park Avenue intersection was discussed, relative to the traffic confusion and movements of the bakery's trucks.

Mr. Lauter moved to table the final plan for the self-storage units at 20 Angelica Street. Mr. Cinfici seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to table the 'Angelica Street Storage' final plan.

1100 Rockland Street Student Housing – preliminary subdivision and land development plan [0:58.10]

Mr. Bogia recalled the April presentation, and the favorable Zoning Hearing Board decision that followed. He said they'd also received written approvals from the Shade Tree Commission, for the landscaping plan, and the Berks County Conservation District, for the erosion controls. He mentioned working with the Planning Office to address the review comments, hoping to move on to the final planning phase. Mr. Miller asked if the reservation of specific parking spaces was inconsistent with the language of the existing easement. Mr. Bogia thought not, and preferred the organization, considering the longer-term parking of the residents when compared with the patrons of the retail spaces. Asked if the existing easement would be recorded with that of the present subdivision, Mr. McLain said they weren't intending to. Mr. Bogia described the painted-red Albright lion-paw prints intended to visually identify the assigned parking spaces. Mr. Bealer thought that a reasonable arrangement, anticipating the needs of the planned restaurant tenants and the habits of the student tenants if not defined. Mr. Cinfici referred to a similar arrangement at the College's neighboring Roessner Hall (1940 North 13th Street). Mr. Lauter asked about the accommodation of the displaced businesses and their potential relocation. Mr. McLain believed the owner (landlord) of the shopping center to be making those arrangements for vacant spaces elsewhere within the mall, but unsure of the progress. He said the issue was limited to the existing liquor store and nail salon. Asked if the first-floor commercial spaces were certain to be restaurants, and the recourse if they proved difficult to fill, Mr. McLain said that is their intent. Mr. Bogia said any other use would have to be consistent with the zoning permitting. Mr. McLain thought the occupancy must be 'synergistic' with the residential balance of the building. Mr. Lauter acknowledged the challenge of retaining tenants, in that end of the mall particularly, and wondered if the spaces could eventually become additional apartment units. Mr. McLain allowed for some 'reevaluation' in such a circumstance. Mr. Bogia expected they'd have to seek additional zoning relief in such a case. Mr. Lauter hoped the student presence would assist the viability of restaurants, but wondered about the strategy for attracting the general public. Mr. Miller thought the viability only more challenged by the vacancy in the 'anchor tenant' space (formerly a Giant grocery store).

Asked about the design of the drop-off area, Mr. Bogia described it as a focal point, with landscaping and space for a possible artwork. Mr. Raffaelli thought other locations, more contiguous to the Albright College campus, were preferable for student housing projects. Reminded that a private developer was proposing the current project and that the College may intend the other properties for athletic facilities, he criticized the mass of the proposed building and the concentration of its occupancy. He felt the College should focus on the student housing needs, rather than the athletic investments, and that the construction should be steel and masonry throughout, rather than the wood-framed upper floors. Mr. Cinfici appreciated the private investment, and the implication that the property would continue to contribute to the tax base. Mr. Miller asked if there were any questions or issues with his review. Mr. Bogia thought they could comply with everything, reminding that they'd requested a waiver from a section of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SLDO) concerning allowed tree species. Mr. Miller referred to a more-current and -qualified list maintained by the Shade Tree Commission. He said he never cites that section of the SLDO, for that reason, but supported the waiver if preferred for the clarity.

Asked for some further explanation of the stormwater system and its connection to the existing downstream seepage beds, Mr. Bogia indicated that the new infiltration bed will receive the new roof leader flows, thinking it better detailed on the post-construction stormwater management (PCSM) plan. Mr. Miller asked if there were any contingencies in that design, that may be implemented following new information gained in the excavation. Mr. Bogia said they already completed the infiltration testing and satisfied the Conservation District. Mr. Johnson noted

that the connection is to another private system and required that owner's approval. He said they'll need some additional information on the infiltration beds. Mr. Krall considered the potential 'surcharge effect' without a direct connection. Mr. Johnson advised a follow-up meeting with the Public Works staff. He asked that two utility easements, for water and sanitary lines shown on the previous 'Rockland Plaza' plans, be included on the present plan. He requested details of the new sanitary sewer tap and any abandonment of existing connections. He advised reconsideration of the 'sump design' of the stormwater inlet, given the standing-water potential for mosquitoes, and asked for some clarification of the access agreements. Mr. Miller asked if they determined the existing easement sufficient to cover the proposed connection, from the residue owner's perspective. Mr. Bogia said they had a right to the connection 'by law'. Mr. Krall disagreed, comparing its private ownership to other 'waters of the Commonwealth', but recognized the language in the existing access easement. Mr. Bogia disagreed, contending that the stormwater 'has to flow the way it does today'. Mr. Miller noted that they were relying on the existing easement, in any case. He referred to the offer of a 'blanket easement' to the City, for access and inspection, and wondered about the same for the downstream facilities located on the residue lot. Mr. Bogia intended to seek that permission from its owner. Mr. Johnson asked that the PCSM plan further clarify each owner's functions and responsibilities.

Asked for the elevation drawings and about any changes since their April presentation, Mr. Bogia said he didn't have them and wasn't aware of any changes but a possible modification to the canopy detail. He recalled the masonry-dominated first level and the synthetic-stucco façade for the floors above. Mr. Lauter thought it preferable to emulate the brick majority of the façades in the Rockland Street neighborhood and Albright College campus especially. Mr. Bogia thought the look would provide some 'flair'. Mr. Lauter suggested that aim may eventually appear 'dated', and only amplified by the building's height. Mr. Miller thought the goal was to 'tie in' to the existing Albright campus. Mr. Bogia thought that achieved by the red accents, and the rest of the palette more reflective of the commercial elements. Mr. Cinfici appreciated the effort to relocate the displaced tenants and the pedestrian connection to Roessner Hall. Mr. Bogia noted such crosswalks elsewhere, and the trend toward designating visual cues for pedestrians supported by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation's (PennDOT) guidance. He said the truck-parking restrictions on Richmond Street have been posted, though its enforcement would probably require a complaint. Mr. Lauter asked how the building's canopy and sidewalk align and connect to the rest of the shopping center. Mr. Bogia believed it was positioned to align with the existing building's face. Asked for a recommendation, Mr. Miller complimented the progress and suggested a conditional preliminary approval.

Mr. Cinfici moved to conditionally approve the '1100 Rockland Street Student Housing' preliminary plan. Mr. Lauter seconded. Mr. Raffaelli questioned the conditions of the approval, recalling past incidents when the Commission had regretted moving ahead on an applicant's assurances. Mr. Miller said it amounts to the usual terms of the staff reviews applied, to some degree, in every approval. And the Commission voted unanimously to grant conditional, preliminary approval the student-housing project at 1100 Rockland Street.

Resolution #24-2016

Other business:

§303.a.1 review-the 'St. Bernardine Street Bridge Replacement' project (Alvernia University) [1:44.48]

Mr. Miller described the referenced section of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code directing the Planning Commission to review street projects. Mr. Smith began with some background on the project and its importance to the Millmont neighborhood. He said they will be reconstructing what has become a more-public thoroughfare for the greater load-bearing capacity and durability. He said they received about 55 percent of what they'd requested from the Multimodal Transportation Fund. That \$1 million combined with a \$425,000 match from the University will cover a reconstruction of the roadbed from just inside the Morgantown Road (PA10) intersection, an entrance the University had improved in 2010 (see also: the August 11, 2009 Planning Commission minutes and zoning permit no. 2009-2664), to where it meets an on-going reconstruction of the campus entrance in front of the Bernardine Sisters' Villa property. He went on to describe the design of the replacement bridge over Angelica Creek, where the current span is limited to 12 tons and excludes certain emergency and public-transportation vehicles. Mr. Otero called the new design 'highway rated', and relayed his consultation with the Fire Marshal for maximum vehicle weights and axle widths. Mr. Smith quoted 88,000 pounds, for the Fire Department's largest apparatus, and noted the proximity to the Fire Training Center, hoping for improved response times with the more-direct route. He mentioned the coordination issue with Berks Nature, and the work on the water lines underneath the roadbed. Mr. Otero mentioned having met with the Public Works Department and resolving the cross-section details accordingly. He said he requested an updated plan from Berks Nature, upon hearing of their resizing of the water lines, and has indicated on his own plans the need for coordination between the contractors, hoping to avoid any digging in a newly-constructed and -paved street. He said the bridge and street construction are being handled

as separate projects for the simplified permitting, and that he'd just received the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) response the day before. He said there'd be no widening or regrading of the roadbed, despite the existing variations in width. Mr. Smith cited the revised budget, but thought there might still be an opportunity for some pedestrian improvements and some parking in a 'bump out' area already paved. Asked about the width of the bridge, Mr. Smith described a precast span, manufactured offsite. Mr. Otero measured a 48-foot wide span, from 'wing wall to wing wall', with two travel lanes, two-foot shoulders, curb, guiderail and a six-foot sidewalk on the downstream side. He said the original design was somewhat narrower but now leaves the possibility for a future bike lane or another sidewalk on upstream side. Mr. Miller noted that he'd been a part of meetings with the Public Works Department and Mr. Johnson acknowledged the communication from the University. Asked about lighting, Mr. Smith said that too was part of the original design, but will be limited to whatever is associated the Berks Nature project. He mentioned a desire to maintain the 'park setting' and said the University's public safety officers will continue to patrol the Park at night.

§508.3 agreement to review extension-Gehris Self Storage [2:04.14]

Mr. Miller said he received the offer by an email the day before, adding that they anticipate resubmitting in time for the July meeting.

Mr. Lauter moved to extend the review of the 'Gehris Self Storage' plan by 90 days, as requested in a June 27th letter email from the project manager. Mr. Raffaelli seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to approve a 90-day extension for the revision-to-record plan for the self-storage facility at 612 McKnight Street.

Resolution #25-2016

§513.a approval reaffirmation-S. 6th Street Family Dollar [2:05.48]

Mr. Lauter moved to reaffirm the February 2016 land development plan approval, in order to reset the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code's deadline for plan recording. Mr. Cinfici seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to reaffirm their February 2nd approval, Resolution No. 1-2016, for the 'S. 6th Street Family Dollar' final plan.

Resolution #26-2016

review the draft May 24, 2016 meeting minutes [2:07.29]

Mr. Cinfici moved to accept the May 24th minutes, with one minor grammatical revision. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to accept the May meeting minutes.

Resolution #27-2016

§207 appointment-representation on the Blighted Property Review Committee [2:09.14]

Mr. Bealer reported that he resigned from the Blighted Property Review Committee at their June 16th meeting, and that William Cinfici would be replacing him when the Committee next met in August. First appointed at the Commission's February 20, 2007 meeting, he cited some recent scheduling conflicts.

Mr. Lauter moved to accept the resignation of Wayne Bealer as the Planning Commission's representative on the Blighted Property Review Committee, and appoint William Cinfici in his place. Mr. Raffaelli seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to appoint William Cinfici to the Blighted Property Review Committee.

Resolution #28-2016

Mr. Lauter moved to adjourn the June meeting. Mr. Cinfici seconded. And the Commission adjourned the June 28th meeting. - 9:56p